



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,845	09/01/2000	Jifa Hao	87552.99R272/SE-1528PD	6844
34799	7590	10/06/2004	EXAMINER	
THOMAS R. FITZGERALD, ESQ. 16 E. MAIN STREET, SUTIE 210 ROCHESTER, NY 14614-1803			NADAV, ORI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/654,845	HAO ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ori nadav	2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15 and 17-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-8, 10-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokura et al. (5,545,908) in view of Schlangenotto et al. (5,063,428) and Schlangenotto et al. (5,773,858, cited by applicant).

Regarding claim 1, Tokura et al. teach in figure 1 and related text a power semiconductor device having high avalanche capability, the device comprising: a semiconductor substrate with two sides and an N+ doped layer 1 extending from one surface of the device into the substrate, an N- doped layer 2 over the N+ doped layer, a P doped well 14 formed in the N- doped layer and extending from the other surface of the device into the N- doped layer, a P+ doped region 10 formed in the - doped well and also extending from the other surface of the device into the P doped well, the P doped well defining an upwardly curving junction between P doped well and the N- doped layer, said upwardly curving junction extending from the lower end of the P doped well to the surface of the device and an N+ doped region (the N+ region which is located away from the P doped well 8) formed in other surface of the device and in the N- doped layer (the N+ doped region is formed in a P doped well, and the P doped well is formed in the N- doped layer. Therefore, the N+ doped region is formed in the N- doped

Art Unit: 2811

layer), said N+ doped region laterally spaced from the P+ doped region and the P doped well.

Tokura et al. do not teach the thickness of the P+ doped region and the P doped well, and recombination centers comprising noble metal impurities disposed substantially in the N - doped layer and P doped well.

Although figure 1 of Tokura et al. does not depict "P-" semiconductor layer, the P doped well 14 can be held as a "P-" semiconductor layer, because P- concentration is a low relative concentration, and the concentration of the P doped well 14 is also a low relative concentration with respect to the P+ doped region 10.

Regarding the claimed limitations of P- doped 2a and P+ doped 2b layers having a combined thickness of about 5 microns to about 12 microns, Schlangenotto et al. (5,063,428) teach that the P- doped 2a and P+ doped 2b layers have a doping curve similar to that of figure 4 (column 7, lines 3-5). Schlangenotto et al. (5,063,428) further teach P+ doped layer 2b having a thickness of 0.2 microns (column 5, lines 33-35), wherein P- doped layer 2a should have a thickness greater than 5 microns and less than 70 microns (column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use P- doped 2a and P+ doped 2b layers having a combined thickness of about 5 microns to about 12 microns, in the device of Tokura et al. in order to form a device as small as possible within the criteria limits of Schlangenotto et al. (5,063,428). Note that at the time the claimed invention was made the size of semiconductor devices has been dramatically minimized.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding the claimed limitations of forming recombination centers comprising noble metal impurities disposed substantially in the N - doped and P- doped layers, Schlengenotto et al. (5,063,428) teach that it is known in the art to form recombination centers comprising noble metal impurities in power diodes in order to reduce charge carrier life (column 1, lines 24-29). Schlengenotto et al. (5,063,428) further teach forming recombination centers in the power diode of figure 3 in order to improve the characteristics of the device (column 5, lines 39-46).

Schlengenotto et al. (5,773,858) teach that it is known to form recombination centers in high speed power diodes in order to improve the dynamic characteristics by lowering the charge carrier life (column 1, lines 21-25).

Schlengenotto et al. (5,063,428) and Schlengenotto et al. (5,773,858) do not limit the location of the recombination centers to specific areas of the power diodes. Therefore, it is understood to an artisan that the recombination centers are formed throughout the power diodes.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form recombination centers comprising noble metal impurities in the device of Tokura et al. in order to improve the dynamic characteristics of the device by lowering the charge carrier life by a well known method. The combination is motivated by the teachings of Schlengenotto et al. (5,063,428) and Schlengenotto et al. (5,773,858) who point out the advantages of forming recombination centers in power diodes. Note that the broad recitation of the claim does not require the recombination centers to be located only in the N - doped and P- doped layers.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding the claimed limitations of a power semiconductor device having high avalanche capability, this feature is inherent in prior art's device, because prior art's device comprises recombination centers, and the avalanche capability is a function of the recombination centers, such as the location and density of the recombination centers. Furthermore, the recitation of a power semiconductor device having high avalanche capability occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Tokura et al. do not teach a P- doped well having a thickness of about 4 microns to about 10 microns and P+ doped region having a thickness of about 0.1 to about 2 microns. Schlangenotto et al. (5,063,428) teach P+ doped layer 2b having a thickness of about 0.1 to about 2 microns (column 5, lines 33-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use P- doped well having a thickness of about 4 microns to about 10 microns and P+ doped region having a thickness of about 0.1 to about 2 microns in the device of Tokura et al. in order to form a device as small as possible within the criteria design limits.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claims 4-7, Tokura et al. do not teach a P- doped well has a dopant level of at least 10^{16} atoms/cm³ and a dopant level of about 2.5×10^{17} atoms/cm³ and a P+ doped region having a dopant level of about 6×10^{19} atoms/cm³, respectively. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a P- doped well having a dopant level of about 2.5×10^{17} atoms/cm³ and a P+ doped region having a dopant level of about 6×10^{19} atoms/cm³ in prior art's device, since forming a P- doped well having a dopant level of about 2.5×10^{17} atoms/cm³ is within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization. Note that differences in concentration or temperature do not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller , 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Hoeschele , 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). For more recent cases applying this principle, see Merck & Co. Inc . v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc. , 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied , 493 U.S. 975 (1989), and In re Kulling , 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claim 8, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form an N- doped layer having a dopant level of about 10^{14} atoms/cm³ to about 10^{15} atoms/cm³ in prior art's device since forming

Art Unit: 2811

an N -doped layer having a dopant level of about 10^{14} atoms/cm³ to about 10^{15} atoms/cm³ is within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization.

Regarding claims 10-11, Schlagenotto et al. (5,063,428) teach noble metal impurities comprise platinum (column 1, lines 26-27).

Regarding the process limitations recited in claim 12 ("recombination centers are formed by platinum diffusion through the N + doped substrate"), these would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that the applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claims 13-14, prior art does not teach platinum impurities at a concentration of about 1×10^{15} to about 1×10^{16} atoms/cm³, and about 2×10^{15} atoms/cm³. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form platinum impurities at a concentration of about 1×10^{15} to about 1×10^{16} atoms/cm³, and about 2×10^{15} atoms/cm³ in prior art's device, in order to adjust the device characteristics according to the requirements of the application in hand, since the reverse current and the device performance depend on the platinum impurities concentration.

Regarding claims 15 and 17, Tokura et al. teach in figure 1 using a diode in a MOSFET or an IGBT power device, wherein an N⁺ doped region 7 disposed in an N-doped layer 2, adjacent P⁺ 10 and P- 8 doped layers.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that prior art does not teach a power semiconductor device having high avalanche capability, because avalanche capability is not a function of the recombination centers. Applicant requests reference that teaches relationship between avalanche capability and recombination.

Avalanche capability of a device is a function of the recombination centers. US patents 5,747,872 and 6,054,369 provide relationship between avalanche capability and recombination. Note that the recitation of a power semiconductor device having high

Art Unit: 2811

avalanche capability occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2811

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1660**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**

Ori Nadav
October 2, 2004



ORI NADAV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800